REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant filed a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on December 14, 2007, citing an Official Action from a foreign patent office in a counterpart application. A copy of our accompanying postcard with the U.S.P.T.O. mailroom date-stamp is enclosed for your consideration. Accordingly, Applicant kindly requests the initialed corresponding PTO 1449 to complete our file.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that claims 10-34 are allowed. Applicant further gratefully acknowledges the indication that claims 2-9 and 57 are objected to but include allowable subject matter. In light of the above amendments and remarks below, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

Pending claims 1, 49-53 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0042979 (Gurvich). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As to Gurvich, the Office Action contends that the input sampling coupler 100 is the recited first terminal, the summer 107 is the second terminal, while distortion sampling coupler 103 is the third terminal. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In this regard, Gurvich fails to teach that summing coupler 107, contended to be the recited second terminal, is to couple to a signal ground. Instead, Gurvich teaches that summer 107 simply sums the output of group delay adjuster circuit 201 and the output of delay line 106. Further, Gurvich fails to teach the recited third terminal that is to couple to an output of a single-ended source. That is, in claim 1 both the first terminal and the third terminal are to couple to the same output, namely an output of a single-ended signal source. Obviously the Office Action must contend that the input to input sampling coupler 100, which Gurvich teaches is an input signal, is the single-ended source. However, this is the only point at which this signal source is coupled. Thus Gurvich fails to teach the recited third terminal. Instead, in Gurvich distortion sampling coupler 103 simply receives the output of a main amplifier 110, and not the same signal that is provided to input sampling coupler 100. As such, Gurvich fails to also disclose recited loops, due to the failure of Gurvich to teach either of the second or third recited terminals. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Gurvich.

For similar reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, Gurvich fails to teach the recited second and third terminals and thus also the first and second loops of claim 49. Furthermore,

Gurvich fails to teach that its signal cancellation loop and error cancellation loop are arranged so that first interfering signal induced in the signal cancellation loop by an interference source is cancelled by a second interfering signal induced in the error cancellation loop by the interference source. Instead, in Gurvich the first loop is simply used to cancel signal noise while the second loop is to cancel an error signal. Gurvich, ¶33-36; FIG. 2 Thus although Gurvich teaches that these two loops may be delay equalized (¶34), the cancellation described in Gurvich is separate for each loop, and there is simply no teaching in Gurvich that a first interfering signal induced in the signal cancellation loop is cancelled by a second interfering signal induced in the error cancellation loop. As such, claim 49 is patentable over the cited art.

The rejection of claims 54 and 55 under §103(a) over Gurvich in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,120,217 (Schwarzmueller) is overcome for at least the same reasons as to claim 49. Furthermore, the cited art fails to teach that the recited first, second and third terminals are pins on an integrated circuit package. That is, while Schwarzmueller teaches that a circuit can be incorporated into an integrated circuit package, there is simply no teaching or suggestion that the contended terminals of Gurvich, which the Office Action states are couplers and a summer, could somehow be implemented as pins on an integrated circuit package. For this further reason, claims 54 and 55 are patentable over the cited art.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/18/08

Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, Texas 77057-2631
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906

RECEIVED IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MJR/sp

Attorney Docket No.: SIL.0006US
Date: December 14, 2007

The Patent and Trademark Office date stamp sets forth the receipt date of the following documents in the below referenced patent application identified as follows:

Applicant(s): RICHARD A. JOHNSON
Serial No.: 10/814,606
Filing Date: March 31, 2004
Title: MAGNETICALLY DIFFERENTIAL INPUT

1. Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (1 Page);
2. PTO 1449 Citing 1 Reference (1 Page);
3. Copy Of The Cited Reference;
4. Check for $180.00; and
5. Postcard.